



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,757	12/14/2001	Scott W. Corzine	10010430-1	2523

7590 09/24/2004
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

PRITCHETT, JOSHUA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2872

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/022,757

Applicant(s)

CORZINE ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua L Pritchett

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19, 21, 23 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20, 22 and 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Amendment filed September 2, 2004. Claim 25 has been amended as requested by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-17, 18, 19, 21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stankus (US 6,150,190) in view of Ho ("High index contrast mirrors for optical microcavities").

Regarding claims 12, 16, 18, 19 and 25, Stankus teaches one or more first/sacrificial layers (62,66) adjacent one or more second/structure layers (64,68), the first and second layers having at least one sidewall (Fig. 9), and a support layer (70) formed over a portion of the sidewalls to support the second layers against movement (Fig. 9). Stankus states that the materials that form layers 62, 64, 66 and 68 can be selected from any material known to form a Bragg grating (col. 8 lines 5-10). Stankus lacks reference to the first and second layers defining

Art Unit: 2872

gaps. Ho teaches the first and second layers defining gaps (Fig. 1a). Ho teaches the use of GaAs and air to form a Bragg grating (Fig. 1a). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the Stankus first and second layers define gaps as taught by Ho for the purpose of forming a Bragg grating.

Regarding claim 13, Stankus teaches the second layer and the support layer comprise substantially the same material (col. 8 lines 5-10). Stankus states that the support layer and the second layer may comprise any material to make a Bragg grating.

Regarding claim 14, Stankus teaches the support layer is at least a portion electrically conductive (col. 8 lines 5-10). Stankus teaches that the support layer may be any material to make a Bragg grating.

Regarding claim 15, Stankus teaches the support layer is at least a portion electrically non-conductive (col. 8 lines 5-10). Stankus teaches that the support layer may be any material to make a Bragg grating.

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Stankus teaches the support layer holds the second/structure layers substantially parallel to each other (Fig. 9).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 20, 22 and 24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2872

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the use of a support layer that partially overlaps the top structure layer.

Claim 26 is allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the use of a support layer overlapping a top portion of the structure layer.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Amendment, filed September 2, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 12, 16 and 25 under Ho have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration of the amended claims, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Stankus in view of Ho.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2872

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua L Pritchett whose telephone number is 571-272-2318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew A Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2872

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JLP 


DREW A. DUNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER